

spending by the Federal Government. But instead of eliminating an SBA office that is a value-added commodity to the taxpayers, that the Small Business Administration generates more in local income and is a stimulus to the local economy and is not, I repeat, not a drain on Federal taxpayers, it would be wrong-headed to go forth and close an office that is a value-added commodity to the taxpayer.

I propose that instead the Small Business Administration consider closing down the Office of Advocacy. This Office of Advocacy was created in a political climate and for political reasons, and with today's budget of \$7 million, it is an economy well worth considering. The Office of Advocacy is often the source of reports and research that many have come to understand to be 7, 8, 9, 10 years old, research that is often outdated.

By retaining the Long Island office of the Small Business Administration, we can generally give a hand up to the local people in Nassau and Suffolk County. I urge that the Clinton administration reconsider the closing of that office.

Let me just mention one case in point. There are many small businesses that have been helped through the guaranteed loan program that works with private lenders. One such case is J. D'Addario and Company, a family owned small business that produces guitar and other instrument strings.

This company benefited from several loans administered by the Long Island office of the Small Business Administration that eventually allowed the business to relocate from rented space where they employed originally 25, to a new location where they are now employing over 250 people. They purchased the land and constructed a site that was four times the size of the previous location.

There are literally hundreds and hundreds of success stories as a result of the efforts made by the men and women who work for the Small Business Administration on Long Island. I know the difficulties administrator Phil Lader faces in making the tough decisions, and he is right to consolidate duplicating programs. To date his efforts have been superb. But again I would ask that the Clinton Administration and the Small Business Administration in particular reconsider closing the Long Island office, and add that this important resource to the small businessmen and women of Long Island be kept open.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT SHOULD HAVE PASSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I was very disappointed today that we were not able to pass the resolution to limit our own congressional terms. I was very disappointed. I think it is a sad day for us. Shame on us. I cannot understand it, because more than two dozen states sent a strong message to us that they want some kind of term limits. The people are tired of all these professional politicians entrenched in Washington, D.C. They want some circulation. Yet we ignore them, because we are so arrogant that we know the best. Today, again, we ignored those people's wishes.

I was listening carefully why some Members are opposed to term limits. Let me tell you how ridiculous it is, the arguments I heard today. The first argument is experience. We need the experience here. What kind of experience do we need, experience how to play politics? Experience how to present speech, feel good speech? Experience how to understand the parliamentary procedure? Is that experience we need?

All this Washington, D.C. experience we do not need. All we need is experience, fresh experience from the outside, the real world. What is happening there us people are suffering every day. Small business is suffering, trying to maintain their business, trying to meet the payroll. That kind of experience we need, not inside-the-beltway experience. It is a ridiculous comparison.

Also one Member from the other side of the aisle mentioned Gen. Colin Powell's statement that it took him 30 years to learn the job, implying that it will take us 30 years to learn this job. That is a ridiculous comparison.

□ 2200

I think it is a sad day that Members using that kind of comparison try to justify why term limits should not be implemented. The second argument I am hearing is that people should decide, not us. Especially from the gentlewoman from California, I was surprised. Only 30 years ago the California voters voted overwhelmingly to supporting term limits. How quickly we forgot. That is another reason why we have got to have some rotation here. How arrogant it is. Only 30 years ago the California people overwhelmingly passed this term limit, yet we forgot. Say they, people should decide. They did, they spoke already.

The other one I am hearing is this nonsense that we are going to give more power to nonelected staff members. Come on. Our staff members, until we passed the bill not too long ago, they do not have very much power. They can be fired, they can be dismissed any time. Laws do not apply to them even. Look at California, we

have term limits out there and state assemblies, the state Senate, the staff does not bother us. They do not take over any powers. They are running fine in Sacramento. That is another stupid argument that I cannot understand.

Finally, this retroactive. I voted yes on that, 12 years retroactive. What is wrong with it? Is not 12 years long enough?

The argument is we need an orderly transfer, otherwise we are going to have a chaotic situation, that so many Members will resign. That is nonsense. The last 2 years ago, when I came to Congress, we had 110 freshmen. This year something like 87. Added together, more than 200 changes in the last 3 years. I do not see any chaos. It was very, a very orderly transfer. As a matter of fact, we made so much change, so much dynamic changes the last two years, I think it is good that we should have such a dramatic change.

Look at California. I do not see any disorderly chaotic situation out there serving only 2 years, only 6 years and give up the seat.

Also they say that they are against it because Democrats are playing games. They do not want to have a term limit. They are playing games. They are using this as an excuse to play games. I do not understand that. I do not know what kind of playing games they are doing. If it is true, then shame on them. But that is another reason why we have to get rid of those folks who know how to play games. They have been here too long. That is why they are playing games. I do not know how to play games. Maybe I should be here 10 years, and then I know how to play games. This bunch of rhetoric that I cannot understand coming from the private sector, it is totally beyond my comprehension why we are rejecting our own term limits.

I think it is really a sad day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SEASTRAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. POSHARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### PERMISSION TO SUBSTITUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak in substitution for the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

#### TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.